


## Attachment A-National (East)




# GSM Corridor LLC FCC Partitions - Northeast




**Attachment A-National (West)**

# GSM Corridor LLC FCC Partitions - West




Attachment A-1

# **GSM Corridor LLC FCC Partition BTA 003**



## Attachment A-2



**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 008, 013, 329 & 407**






Attachment A-3

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 008, 013, 366 & 407**




## Attachment A-4

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 008, 144, 162, 245, 347 & 362**



Attachment A-5

**GSM Corridor LLC**  
**FCC Partition**  
**BTA 040 & 296**




Attachment A-6

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 063,227,  
249, 274, 352, 388**

14 0 14 28 42  
Miles


- Cities > 30K
- Highway Portion
- BTA Boundary
- Primary Highway





Attachment **A-7**


**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 110**



Attachment A-8



**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 110, 172 & 325**

- Cities >50K
- Highway Portion
- BTA Boundary
- Primary Highway




## Attachment A-9

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 142, 391 & 138**



Attachment **A-10**

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 167, 256, 325 & 411**





**Attachment A-11**

**GSM Corridor  
FCC Partition  
BTA 168 & 399**

UT

Provo

Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT  
399

Grand Junction CO  
168

St. George, UT  
392




- Cities > 50K
- Highway Portion
- BTA Boundary
- Primary Highway

Attachment


## Attachment A-12

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 187, 275, 396 & 445**



## Attachment A-13

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 244, 420 & 447**



## Attachment A-14



**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 245, 365, 392 & 399**

Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT  
399

Provo-Orem, UT

365

HWY365

I-15

HWY399

I-70

HWY392

St. George, UT  
392

La8 Vegas, NV  
245

HWY245


18 0 18 36 54  
Miles

- Cities > 50K
- Highway Portion
- BTA Boundary
- Primary Highway



Attachment A-15

**GSM Corridor LLC  
FCC Partition  
BTA 400 & 401**



## EXHIBIT B: Response to Question 77

AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC ("AWP"), a real party in interest, hereby submits this response to Question 77 of the FCC Form 603 concerning allegations against AWP in pending matters. While these cases may fall outside the scope of disclosures required by Question 77, they are nevertheless being reported out of an abundance of caution.

On or about September 30, 2002, a case captioned *Beeler, et al. v. AT&T Cellular Services, Inc., et al.* was filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division (Case No. 02C 6975). AWP is named as a defendant, along with several other wireless carriers providing service in the Chicago metropolitan area. Plaintiffs allege that the defendant carriers market handsets and wireless service through tying arrangements, and that each has monopolized the market for sales of handsets to its own subscribers.

On or about September 20, 2002, a case captioned *Truong, et al. v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al.* was filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Case No. C 02 4580). AWP is named as a defendant, along with several other wireless carriers providing service in the San Francisco metropolitan area. This complaint is substantively identical to that filed in the Beeler case, described above.

On or about August 23, 2002, a case captioned *Millen, et al. v. AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, et al.* was filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Case No. 02-11689). AWP is named as a defendant, along with several other wireless carriers providing service in the Boston metropolitan area. This complaint is substantively identical to that filed in the Beeler and Truong cases, described above.

On or about April 5, 2002, a case captioned *Wireless Consumers Alliance, Inc., et al. v. AT&T Cellular Services, Inc., et al.* was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (Case No. 02 CV 2637). AWP is named as a defendant, along with several other wireless carriers providing service in the New York metropolitan area. Plaintiffs seek to certify a class consisting of persons who have purchased wireless service within the New York metropolitan area during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the complaint, and seek injunctive relief and damages under Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

On or about September 5, 2001, the second amended complaint in a case captioned *DiBraccio v. AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., et al.* was filed in Florida State Court (Eleventh Judicial Circuit, in and for Miami-Dade County) (Case No. 99-20450 CA-20). AWP is named as a defendant, along with ABC Cellular Corp., a reseller of wireless services and handsets in South Florida. Plaintiff seeks damages for alleged monopolization of wireless phone services in South Florida under Section 542.19 of the Florida Statutes and conspiracy to monopolize under the same statute.